

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

CKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO.	
7465	
EXAMINER	
JONES, DWAYNE C	
T PAPER NUMBER	

DATE MAILED: 02/26/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

•			
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/038,135	AMES ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Dwayne C Jones	1614	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a repl - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailin earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	136(a). In no event, however, may a ly within the statutory minimum of thi will apply and will expire SIX (6) MOI a, cause the application to become A	reply be timely filed ty (30) days will be considered timely. NTHS from the mailing date of this cor BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	nmunication.
Status			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19D			
2a)☐ This action is FINAL . 2b)☒ This action is non-final.			
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.			
closed in accordance with the practice under t	=x parte Quayle, 1955 C.L	7. 11, 455 O.G. 215.	
Disposition of Claims			
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>62-131</u> is/are pending in the applicati			
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.			
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.			
6) Claim(s) 62-131 is/are rejected.			
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.			
o) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.			
Application Papers			
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.			
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.			
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).			
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.			
11) I he oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	kaminer. Note the attache	d Oπice Action or form PTC	J-152.
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).			
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:			
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.			
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No			
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage			
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).			
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.			
Attachment(s)			
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)		Summary (PTO-413)	
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)		s)/Mail Date nformal Patent Application (PTO-	152)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 200CT2001.	6) Other:	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	,

Page 2

Application/Control Number: 10/038,135

Art Unit: 1614

DETAILED ACTION

Status of Claims

- 1. Claims 62-131 are pending.
- 2. Claims 62-131 are rejected.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 62-131 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Information Disclosure Statement

- 4. The information disclosure statement filed October 20, 2001 has been reviewed and considered, see enclosed copy of PTO FORM 1449.
- 5. The information disclosure statement filed December 8, 2003 fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(1), which requires a list of all patents, publications, or other information submitted for consideration by the Office. It has been placed in the application file, but the information referred to therein has not been considered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Application/Control Number: 10/038,135

Art Unit: 1614

- 7. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:
 - 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
 - 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
 - 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
 - 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
- 8. Claims 62-131 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Krishna et al. Krishna et al. teach of the protective effects of inter alia hydroxylamines. Krishna et al. teach that cellular damage may result from the cytotoxicity of reactive oxygen species, (see column 1, page 3477). Krishna et al. also teach that the reactive oxygen species are byproducts of normal processes in aerobic environments, and when there are imbalances in these reactive oxygen species oxidative stress results to cells, (see page 3477). Krishna et al. also disclose that hydroxylamines have been shown to protect mammalian cells exposed to reactive oxygen species, such as super oxide, hydrogen peroxide, organic hydroperoxides, and redox cycling and anticancer agents, (see column 2, page 3478). In addition, Krishna et al. teach of screening methods to test the effectiveness of hydroxylamines to provide protection to mammalian cells that are exposed to a reactive oxygen species, namely hydrogen peroxide. The results were performed with an in vitro assay, (see column 2, page 3478). In the assay model of this teaching the efficacy of the antioxidant, such as hydroxylamine, was evaluated by exposing the cells to a reactive oxygen species, namely hydrogen peroxide, and assessing the viability of the cells both in the absence and in the presence of a fixed

Application/Control Number: 10/038,135

Art Unit: 1614

concentration of the test compound, (see column 2, page 3480). The assessment would compare the amounts of the reactive oxygen species present, while the instant invention is comparing the amounts of the antioxidant of the hydroxylamine present after contact with the cells. There are many ways to measure the concentration of an assay, such as a decrease in the concentration of the unwanted species or compound, (as in Krishna et al.) or still by measuring the concentration of the antioxidant compound of the hydroxylamine (as is obviously claimed by applicant).

The instant claims differ only in screening methods for primary hydroxylamines 9. whereas the prior art reference of Krishna et al. are directed to screening methods with the utilization of secondary amines. The skilled artisan would most certainly been motivated from the screening methods of Krishna et al. to employ other antioxidant or cytoprotective hydroxylamine compounds to protect cells from the deleterious effects due to oxidative damage due to inter alia, reactive oxygen species. The generation of reactive oxygen species, as taught by Krishna et al., is evident in many various biochemical and aerobic environments. Accordingly, if a cellular event such as from a variety of scenarios, for instance ischemia or inflammation or cancer or cytokines or still other events, which can generate and cause oxidative damage to a cell, would be obviously protected with the presence of hydroxylamine compounds, as clearly taught by Krishna et al. Clearly, it would have been obvious to the skilled artisan to utilize other hydroxylamine compounds and derivatives, which would obviously include primary hydroxylamine compounds and their derivatives, because the reaction between the oxidative damage lies between the reactive oxygen species and they hydroxylamine

Art Unit: 1614

moiety. The skilled artisan would additionally be motivated to use primary hydroxylamine compounds and their derivatives especially since the hydroxylamine moiety of a primary hyrdroxyl amine is less sterically hindered than a primary hydroxylamine compound.

Page 5

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to D. C. Jones whose telephone number is (571) 272-0578. The examiner can normally be reached on Mondays, Tuesdays, Thursday, and Fridays from 8:30 am to 6:00 pm. The official fax No. for correspondence is (703) 872-9306.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Marianne Seidel, may be reached at (571) 272-0584.

Tech.\Ctr. 1614 February 20, 2004